

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529

Identifying data deleted to
prevent unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

CI

FILE:

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date:

JUL 09 2004

IN RE:

Petitioner:


Beneficiary:

PETITION: Petition for Special Immigrant Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), as described at Section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(C)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.


Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a church. It seeks to classify the beneficiary as a special immigrant religious worker pursuant to section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), to perform services as an assistant pastor. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had been engaged continuously in a qualifying religious vocation or occupation for two full years immediately preceding the filing of the petition. The director also determined that the petitioner had not established that it qualified as a bona fide nonprofit religious organization. The director further determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary was qualified for the position within the religious organization. Finally, the director determined that the petitioner had failed to establish that it had extended a valid job offer to the beneficiary, or that it had the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage.

Counsel for the petitioner timely filed a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Unit, in which he stated that the evidence submitted was more than enough to prove the beneficiary qualified for the visa preference classification. Counsel indicated on the Form I-290B that a brief and/or additional evidence would be forwarded to the AAO within 30 days. As of the date of this decision, more than seven months after the appeal was filed, no further documentation has been received by the AAO. Therefore, the record will be considered complete as presently constituted.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

As the petitioner has failed to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in this proceeding, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.